

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/812,747	KASAI ET AL.	
	Examiner Rudy Zervigon	Art Unit 1763	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rudy Zervigon. (3) _____.
 (2) James Judge. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 May 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ishii (US5685942); Kumihashi (US5368685).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Rudy Zervigon S177
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Judge requested clarification of the Examiner's rationale and positions. The Examiner emphasized his opinion that both the apparatus components and the method/algorithim components of the claims are each not novel independently. As a result, the Examiner's application of Ishii illustrates the evidence in the prior art that all the apparatus components are taught in the prior art albeit the method/algorithim component is not ALONG with the claimed method/algorithim. However, the Examiner's evidence of Kumihashi illustrates that the method/algorithim alone is not novel. Collectively then the combined teachings of the prior art suggests the Examiner's proposed rejection which is believed to be Applicant's invention.